

### REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is responsive to the Office Action mailed on September 2, 2005. In that action: claims 12 and 30 were allowed; claims 1-11, 20-29, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement; claims 1-3, 5-10, 20-22, 24-29, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dekelbaum et al. (USPN 5,838,682); claims 4 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dekelbaum et al.; and claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dekelbaum et al. in view of Sassin (USPN 6,449,260).

Claims 1-12 and 20-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 20, and 31 have been amended to remove the limitation related to current and previous sessions. Applicant submits that all claims are in allowable form and requests reconsideration of the rejections of the pending claims.

**Applicant submits that it would be inappropriate to refuse to enter the amendments after the Final Office Action because they require further consideration or raise new issues. The amendments merely revert part of the claim language to a slight variation from a previously submitted form.**

Claims 1, 20 and 31 were rejected as failing to meet the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The Examiner issued the rejection because claims 1, 20, and 31 included the limitation “both in a current session and in previous sessions.” Applicant has removed this limitation from those claims. Applicant has amended claims 1, 20, and 31 and, as amended, these claims are supported by the present patent application at page 7, line 34 (“all web pages viewed by the system user in the same domain.”). Applicant submits, therefore, that the

written description requirement rejection of these claims and the claims that depend on them has been traversed.

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Dekelbaum. Claim 1 as currently amended includes “all web pages which the system user has previously viewed in a particular domain.” In response to Applicant’s argument (filed June 7, 2005) that Dekelbaum does not disclose the ability to view any pages previously viewed both in a current session and in previous sessions, Examiner cites col. 14, lines 21-33 as teaching “the client’s session history (previous session) displays current web pages as well as preceding web pages.” While a session history includes immediately preceding web pages, web pages contained in a session history do not contain all of the web pages described by claim 1 (i.e. “all web pages viewed in a particular domain”). Briefly, any given session is a subset of all the communications with a domain.

Applicant directs attention to the passage cited by the Examiner. In that passage, Dekelbaum discloses:

one method of coordinating between Internet accesses and incoming calls is to cause Internet Server 102 maintain a record of pages accessed by a particular client, i.e., a session history, and to issue a session identification number (“session ID”) to a client upon the client requesting a HTML page including autodialing hyperlinks. The sales representative solicits the session ID from each caller upon initial contact and uses it to retrieve session history for that client from the Internet Server 102 using workstations 112a-112c. Upon inputting the session ID, the client’s session history is automatically downloaded into the Web Browser 120 used by the sales representative so that the current and immediately preceding pages accessed by the client from Internet Server 102 are available for viewing by the sales representative.

(Column 14, Lines 19-33). Therein Dekelbaum discloses a session ID-based “session history” that does not disclose including in that session history either a previous session or a previous session ID, much less all web pages previously viewed in a particular domain. Dekelbaum discloses that the session history includes the current and immediately preceding pages accessed by the client. Dekelbaum does not disclose the ability to view all web pages previously viewed

in a particular domain, nor does it suggest a particular method or system capable of doing so. Dekelbaum, therefore, fails to disclose all of the limitations in claim 1.

Applicant submits that these arguments do not rely upon an interpretation of “session” and “domain” as the above noted deficiencies in Dekelbaum’s disclosure are apparent from the plain meaning given the words. Further, Applicant submits that the words as used within Dekelbaum and the present Application support these meanings. Additionally, if Examiner finds the plain meaning and usage in Dekelbaum and the present Application of the words “session” and “domain” ambiguous, Applicant submits that the definitions as presented by Applicant are supported by Netwon’s Telecom Dictionary (20<sup>th</sup> ed., 2004) (hereinafter “Newton’s”). Newton’s defines “domain” as: “In the MIS world, a domain is ‘the part of a computer network in which the data processing resources are under common control.’” Newton’s defines “session” a: “A set of transmitters and receivers, and the data streams that flow between them. In other words, an active communication, measured from beginning to end, between devices or applications over a network.” Applicant submits that even an unnecessary reliance on Newton’s yields the conclusion that web pages included in a session history is not necessarily coextensive with the set of web pages defined by “all web pages previously viewed in a particular domain.” Therefore, even an unnecessary interpretation analysis supports Applicant’s submission that Dekelbaum does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 is in allowable form as amended. Applicant submits that independent claims 20 and 31 are also in allowable form as amended, for similar reasons to those discussed above.


Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-11, being dependent on claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons stated for claim 1 and due to the additional limitations therein. Further,

Applicant submits that dependent claims 21-29, being dependent on claim 20, are allowable for the same reasons.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

Robert G. Crouch

Registration No. 34,806

3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411

Aurora, Colorado 80014

(720) 562-5506

Date: November 1, 2005